UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,090	02/08/2006	Moti Harel	026086.047.29US	2449
	7590 12/02/201 N ALLEN PLLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 1370)6	ORWIG, KEVIN S		
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1611	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/02/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/534,090	HAREL, MOTI	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Kevin S. Orwig	1611	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 November 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS		-	
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth		
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(t	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	ED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. 🔯 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause
(a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		i E below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	* **	mpliant Amondment (I	OTOL 324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpilant Amendment (i	- TOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>87-100,103-105,107-116 and 121-123</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>101, 102, and 117</u>	<u>-120</u> .		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		- 41 - 5	h
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attache	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Allison M. Ford/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1651	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amended claims filed after final will not be entered because they present new limitations not previously presented, such as the limitation that the particle is formulated to begin dissolving within the pH range of an animal's foregut. This new limitation would require further search and consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The previous responses to arguments are incorporated herein. Briefly, Tester does NOT teach away from the combination of starch and alginate for at least the reason that this combination is EXEMPLIFIED by Tester (e.g. Ex. 7), and Tester repeatedly states that alginate-starch combinations are symbiotic, imparting beneficial and unique gelling, entrapment and digestibility characteristics to the formulations (e.g. p. 16, lines 20-25). Applicant continues to argue that the references have not been considered as a whole and that all the features of the secondary reference are not compatible with the primary reference. The combined references have been considered as a whole. Applicant is reminded that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). The other arguments are not persuasive because they are directed to limitations not in the presently examined claim set (i.e. the claims filed after final and not entered).